

## Chapter 2

# Immigrant Integration

**Abstract** The chapter gives an overview of classical and contemporary sociological models of immigrant integration, including a critical discussion of potential discontinuities between contemporary migration and migration at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The chapter starts with a critical reflection on the manifold terms used to describe patterns of immigrant settlement. I argue that, from a sociological perspective, the concept of integration is well suited to serve as an overall concept, describing the interrelation between an individual and society, with assimilation being but one empirical possibility.

The review then comprises two parts. The first part discusses the classic models of immigrant integration, including race-relation cycles (R. E. Park as well as E. S. Bogardus), social psychological accounts of changing group membership (R. Taft), as well as the works of Shmuel N. Eisenstadt and Milton M. Gordon. The second part reviews contemporary models of immigrant integration: the modes of incorporation model by Alejandro Portes and Ruben Rumbaut, the theory of segmented assimilation by Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, as well as the model of intergenerational integration by Hartmut Esser. Contemporary models improve the earlier ones in that they forego linear and deterministic conceptions of the integration process, pay heed to the contextual characteristics, and allow for deducing testable hypothesis. I argue that the model of intergenerational integration, with a general sociological theory of action at its core, may be the most versatile as it is not constructed with reference to a specific geographical or historical context and may be applied even if conditions change.

**Keywords** Immigration · Integration · Incorporation · Assimilation · Segmented assimilation · Modes of incorporation

This work is as much a work on immigrant integration as it is on immigrant transnationalism. As I argued in the introduction, immigrant integration and immigrants' transnational involvement belong together, as they are both part of the same phenomenon: migration. The review is intended to laying out the ground for this work. It consists of three parts. The first part reviews classical models of immigrant integration—the race relation cycles by Robert Park (1936, 1950, 1970 [1921], 1967 [1925], 1921) and Emory Bogardus (1930), Ronald Taft's (1957, 1961, 1962a, b,

1963) socio-psychological model of changing one's group membership, Shmuel Eisenstadt's (1953, 1954a, b, 1956) conception of the absorption of immigrants, and Milton Gordon's (1964) account of immigrant assimilation. The second part discusses criticisms directed at these classical models of immigrant assimilation, which question the models' applicability and are motivated by (potential) differences between contemporary and past immigration experiences. In the third part, three contemporary models of immigrant integration, the modes of incorporation model, the theory of segmented assimilation by Alejandro Portes, Ruben Rumbaut, and Min Zhou (Portes and Rumbaut 2005; Portes and Zhou 1993; Zhou 1997; Zhou and Xiong 2005; Rumbaut and Portes 2001) and the model of intergenerational integration by Hartmut Esser (1980, 2004, 2006b, c), are examined in detail.

## 2.1 A Note on Terminology

Before starting with the discussion of theoretical models of immigrant integration, a few clarifying notes on terminology are necessary. Theories on immigrant integration not only differ in how they conceive of immigrant integration, but also in the terms they use to describe it. Within this field of study, there is ample confusion of concepts and definitions—we can easily find more than 30 terms that relate to immigrant integration in one way or another (Ikonomu 1989, p. 264). In part, this is owed to an unfortunate conceptual arbitrariness in the social sciences. But this is not the only reason. Immigrant integration has always been subject to intense normative political and public debates, which is, to some extent, mirrored in scientific controversies. Concepts like acculturation, adaptation, assimilation, integration, pluralism, multiculturalism, and the like carry with them normative connotations. “[A]ssimilation has acquired such a bad name [...] that it has come to be associated, as a kind of automatic reflex, with the narrowest understanding of Anglo-conformity or worst excesses of Americanization campaigns. In Germany, if anything, the word ‘assimilation’ has been even more strongly ‘contaminated’ and disqualified by its association with forcible Germanyization” (Brubaker 2003, p. 41). By using terms like assimilation or acculturation, one runs the danger of being judged as old fashioned and outdated or even as antipluralistic and imperialistic (Gans 1992a, p. 48). To be sure, some of the early theoretical accounts of integration were *assimilationist* in the sense that they perceived the immigrants' unilateral adaptation as necessary, inevitable, and desirable (Park and Miller 1921). They have, in part, been justly criticized for ethnocentric and nationalist connotations.

Given that this field of inquiry is normatively charged, it appears difficult at times to disentangle scientific and normative debates. But there is no alternative to it, because most of the confusion within this field is caused by the conflation of normative and scientific discourses.<sup>1</sup> If we rule out empirically possible paths of immigrant integration from our inquiries, because they appear normatively undesirable, we will

---

<sup>1</sup> Choosing a certain theory is itself a normative choice, but this is a different debate; it touches on the controversy of the role of values and norms in scientific research and the so-called ‘Werturteilsstreit’, which has been with sociology from its beginnings up to today (Albert and Topitsch 1971; Weber 1968).

distort these inquiries. Thus, we should distinguish between assimilation as *ideology* and assimilation as an *empirical possibility*. We should try to differentiate between a value-free examination of empirical processes and a normative discourse on what we esteem to be desirable. Whether assimilation or multiculturalism dominates the political or societal discourse, the scientific inquiry itself is well advised to steer clear of these discourses. If we do not, we will come up with biased and scientifically unsatisfactory interpretations (Lucassen 2006, p. 16).

By doing so, we also avoid the seeming necessity to constantly introduce new and ‘unladen’ terms that are intended to keep us at distance from politicized debates. But since there is already ample confusion of ideas and concepts, a disambiguation seems necessary before reviewing the work on immigrant integration. Among the many concepts in the literature, adaptation, acculturation, assimilation, integration, and incorporation are the most prominent. All these concepts refer to the way immigrants become accommodated to or adapt to the situation in the receiving country. Empirically, there are many possibilities to adapt to living in the receiving country; assimilation is one of them and maintenance of an ethnic orientation is another. I suggest using integration as a neutral, superordinate concept, which refers in a general way to the (interdependent) relations between persons (or groups) (Esser 2000, p. 261; Lockwood 1964, p. 245). Elsewhere, mostly in the Anglo-American literature, the term incorporation is proposed to fulfill this function (Alba and Nee 1997, 2003; Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006; Rumbaut and Portes 2001). But as will be shown later in this chapter, the term integration is better suited, since it is well compatible with general sociological theory.

Immigrant integration can be approached from a micro-sociological or macro-sociological perspective. From a micro-sociological perspective, integration refers to individual processes (e.g. distinct paths), whereas from a macro-sociological perspective, it refers to (aggregate) outcomes that describe the relation between immigrant groups and native groups (Esser 2008b, p. 312)—both of which are complementary for the understanding of processes of integration. At times, the term integration trajectory is used in this work to describe individual courses of integration over time. Accordingly, this work’s understanding of trajectories is level-based and trajectories are defined as time-dependent patterns of increase, decrease, or stability of a characteristic of interest (George 2009, pp. 164–165).

Since assimilation is a potential form of integration, we can apply the same distinction: assimilation as a micro-sociological concept then describes the process by which individual immigrants become culturally and socially more similar to the autochthonous population. Within this process, acculturation describes the acquisition of the receiving country’s language skills, cultural knowledge, and norms. Assimilation as a macro-sociological concept, in contrast, describes a state of similarity, in which an immigrant group has become undistinguishable from the autochthonous population. In this sense, assimilation can be understood as the absence of differences. This understanding of assimilation is inherently relational—it describes one group (or person) and its relation to another group (or person). A slightly different, yet compatible and for the Anglo-American debate important understanding of assimilation is provided by Alba and Nee (1997, p. 863). They define assimilation as the decline and disappearance of ethnic and racial distinctions and the accompanying cultural and social differences.

It is important to note that this parity between immigrant and native groups can be achieved in various ways. Similarity between two groups can come about if the immigrant group adapts to the standards of the autochthonous group. Yet, similarity can also be achieved if the autochthonous group adapts to the standards of the immigrant group or simply if the boundaries between groups become irrelevant. Therefore, assimilation as an individual process is but one possibility that might (or might not, as we will see later) lead to similarity, i.e. assimilation, at the aggregate level.

At this point, a note on the normative (un)desirability of assimilation seems appropriate: if we define assimilation in the above way, then some aspects of assimilation (at the macro level) are desirable. If an immigrant group's level of income and education is well below the level of the native group, for instance, then achieving similarity, i.e. assimilation, in this area is desirable. In general, achieving similarity between groups on the socio-economic dimension is desirable, as it translates into parity of life chances. Thus, assimilation on this dimension is desirable—recall that assimilation means being or becoming similar. However, in other domains, like the cultural, assimilation might not be desired and not necessary for achieving parity in life chances—although this point is being debated.

This understanding of assimilation is not limited to the investigation of inter-ethnic relations in immigration societies. We can apply the concept of assimilation to investigate any inter-group relation. For instance, it can be applied to describe the relationship between Protestants and Catholics. This relationship has at times been very antagonistic, with violent wars waged in Europe and systematic social and physical exclusion of one or the other religious group. The boundaries between these groups may have appeared impenetrable. Today, however, in most Western European societies, differences between these two groups have vanished: Protestants and Catholics have become similar in the sense that their life chances are not systematically structured by the denomination, i.e. their group membership. Of course, there are exceptions: Ireland is an example of this, where the boundaries between Protestants and Catholics are still strong. And even in the USA a Catholic President was inconceivable for the WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) mainstream still in the 1950s.

Sometimes, assimilation is conflated with socio-economic mobility. This is a misunderstanding (for a detailed discussion on the relation between mobility and assimilation see Gans 2007). Socio-economic (upward) mobility is commonly understood as an increase in the level of income, wealth, education, employment status, and the standard of living. However, immigrants can assimilate without socio-economic mobility and vice versa. Assimilation might entail upward mobility for a group, but neither does upward mobility necessarily bring about aggregate similarity nor is assimilation as an individual strategy always necessary for upward mobility. The latter is, for instance, documented by the rich literature on ethnic entrepreneurship (e.g. Schunck and Windzio 2009; Waldinger et al. 1990; Kloosterman and Rath 2001; Light 2005). In the course of the following review, some additional concepts appear—for instance, absorption. These can be easily interpreted with respect to the previous clarification.

## 2.2 Race Relation Cycles: Robert Park and Emory Bogardus

The first attempts to theorize the integration of immigrants, which still influence sociology today, are the so-called race relation cycles. These models understand immigrant integration as a typical and linear sequence of stages of inter-group interactions which ends with the complete absorption of the immigrant group.

The most well-known race relation cycle is probably that of Robert E. Park, who was a prominent Chicago School sociologist. The Chicago School was one of the birthplaces of the sociological study of immigrant integration, being the home of William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, Ernest W. Burgess, and Milton Gordon, whose seminal work profoundly influenced not only the study of immigrant integration but sociology as a whole. The Chicago School's prominent role also explains why much of the work on integration is so strongly influenced by the American immigration experience of the nineteenth and early twentieth century—a fact that we will return to later in this chapter.

The work of the early Chicago School rests on the notion that the relationship between groups is dominated by competition over scarce resources, such as valuable spatial and social positions within a society based on the division of labor (Park 1936, p. 3). Although competition is not the only form of group interactions, it is seen as the major driving force: “[o]f the four great types of interaction—competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation, competition is the elementary, universal and fundamental form” (Park and Burgess 1970 [1921], p. 187).

These four types of general forms of interactions appear as stages in Park's race relation cycle. The first stage in the process is contact between the immigrants and the autochthonous population. This stage is characterized by a (friendly) curiosity among the autochthonous population. At the same time, the immigrants try to orient themselves in the new society and search for satisfactory ways to conduct their lives. This, however, inevitably leads to competition between immigrants and the autochthonous population in the labor- and housing market (Park 1950, p. 106). Competition then leads to conflict, the second stage. The autochthonous population is willing to allow the immigrants only to take up those positions in the social structure which they deem undesirable. This leads to conflicts over valued positions that come with discrimination, upheavals, and even racial conflicts. What follows is a long process of adaptation. This includes giving up unilateral claims, residential segregation, and the immigrants retreat into niches of the labor market that the autochthonous population is not interested in. This produces an ethnic division of labor and ethnic stratification. The acceptance of this system of ethnic stratification and differentiation makes for the third stage, accommodation. In this stage, the autochthonous population and the immigrants come to accept the ethnic differentiation and stratification as legitimate. Over time, however, there will be an inevitable diffusion of the autochthonous population and the immigrant group. This diffusion leads to an erosion and disappearance of the ethnic system of stratification and eventually to the fourth stage, assimilation. As Park and Burgess describe it, a “process of interpenetration and fusion by which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons

**Table 2.1** The race relation cycle according to Bogardus

Stage	Description
1. Curiosity	Curious, sympathetic responses towards immigrants
2. Economic welcome	Economic integration owed to immigrants' acceptance of low wages and adverse working conditions
3. Industrial and social antagonism	Immigrants are seen as a threat; (organized) anti-immigrant campaigns, resulting in segregation and blocked mobility
4. Legislative antagonism	Politicians exploit xenophobic fears, proposing legislations against immigration
5. Fair-play tendencies	(Unorganized) counter movements calling for ending discrimination
6. Quiescence	Slowing in antagonistic tendencies, with possible renewal of sympathy
7. Second generation difficulties	(Partial) Integration of the second generation into the receiving country; possible exclusion if racially or culturally distinct from autochthonous population

or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (Park and Burgess 1970 [1921], p. 360). A prerequisite for the demise of ethnic differentiation and stratification is the dissolution of ethnic institutions, in particular the ethnic communities.

Emeroy Bogardus (1930) was also among the first to propose a race relation cycle. Bogardus worked at the University of Southern California, but he received his PhD at the University of Chicago. He describes the integration of immigrants in seven stages (see Table 2.1). The first stage, curiosity, is characterized by a friendly interest and sympathy for the newly arrived immigrants (Bogardus 1930, p. 613). This is followed by an economic welcome, which makes for the second stage. The immigrants are absorbed into the receiving country’s economy, usually into sectors of the labor market that the autochthonous population perceives as undesirable. The immigrants are welcomed as (cheap) labor. In the next stage, however, industrial and social antagonism, the autochthonous population comes to see the immigrants as rivals, owed to the growing number of immigrants and their descendants as well as their desire for upward social mobility (Bogardus 1930, p. 614). The autochthonous population fears the immigrants’ lack of assimilation, the residential segregation, and the higher fertility and, as a result, attempts to block the immigrants’ access to certain residential areas and hinder their occupational upward mobility.

This also leads to jurisdictional measures against the immigrants in the stage of legislative antagonism. Politicians try to benefit from the xenophobic fears of the autochthonous population and enact legislation that specifically target the immigrants (Bogardus 1930, p. 616). But these measures contradict the receiving society’s universalistic values—we have to bear in mind that Bogardus developed this model with explicit reference to the American immigration experience in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This contradiction is noticed by part of the receiving society and produces “fair play tendencies”—the fifth stage. In this stage, considerations are voiced which aim at eliminating discrimination. Although the opposition

to discriminatory measures is not well organized, it eventually succeeds, not least because the receiving country's reputation is damaged if it discriminates against its immigrants. The antagonism is followed by a "quiescence," which may even bring about a new wave of sympathy for the immigrants (Bogardus 1930, p. 616). The last stage in Bogardus race relation cycle then consists of "second generation difficulties" (Bogardus 1930, p. 617). The immigrants' offspring assimilates into the receiving society's core spheres and loses its connection with the parents' country of origin. However, in some cases, the second generation faces the problem of being only partially integrated into the receiving society, in particular if it is racially or culturally distinct from the autochthonous population.

In some aspects, Park's and Bogardus' conception of a race relation cycle are similar, in some they differ. They differ most notably in the role the host society takes in their models. Bogardus places more emphasis on the (political) reaction of the host society, whereas Park concentrates more on the competition between the groups. They have a similar pattern of stages with curious and friendly contacts in the beginning, more or less open animosities in the middle of the process, and a coming to terms (accommodation) followed by the assimilation of the immigrants' offspring.

These models have been criticized for depicting the process of immigrant integration as linear, progressive, and irreversible with only one possible endpoint: the complete assimilation of the immigrant group (Esser 1980, p. 48 ff.; Liebersohn 1961; Lyman 1968, p. 17 ff.; Price 1969, p. 214 ff.; Shibutani et al. 1965, p. 131 ff.). Empirically, this is obviously not the case. Assimilation as the complete disappearance of differences between immigrants and natives is not necessarily the only possible result. Stable forms of ethnic differentiation and stratification may develop, with differences between ethnic groups visible still after generations. Park acknowledges this by stating, "[. . .] when stabilization is finally achieved race relations will assume one of three configurations. They will take the form of a caste system, [. . .] they will terminate in complete assimilation [. . .] or the unassimilated will constitute a permanent racial minority within the limits of a national state [. . .]" (Park 2005 [1950], p. 194). Despite the recognition that assimilation is not necessarily the sole endpoint of inter-group relations, this does not take a prominent position in Park's work and is not formally incorporated into the race relation cycle.

The race relation cycles, especially that of Park, have furthermore often been criticized for neglecting the immigrants' influence on the receiving society. The process of influence and adaptation is assumed to be unidirectional. But the presence of (large) groups of immigrants will influence the receiving society as well. Cultural practices will diffuse and this is a bidirectional process. This criticism is justified, despite Park and Burgess' (1970 [1921], p. 360) acknowledgment of a possible mutuality in influence, since this point is also not developed further within their theoretical model. Although the race relation cycles describe certain historic experiences quite well, they do not actually explain immigrant integration. Rather, they have to be understood as inductive quasi-laws resting on implicit assumptions on inter-ethnic interactions that take very specific historic, political, and social conditions for granted (Esser 1980, p. 48). The works of Ronald Taft (1957, 1961, 1962a, 1967, 1970) and Shmuel Eisenstadt (1953, 1954a, b, 1956) are more sophisticated in this regard.



**Table 2.2** Change of group membership according to Taft. (Source: Taft 1957, p. 144)

Stage	Internal	External
1. Knowledge of group II culture	Assumed knowledge	Actual knowledge
2. Attitude to group II	Favorable Attitudes to (i) the members (ii) the norms (iii) own membership in group II	Active seeking of (i) interactions with group II members (ii) participation in activities (iii) membership
3. Attitude to group I	Unfavorable Attitudes to (i) the members (ii) the norms (iii) own membership in group I	Withdrawal from (i) interactions with group I members (ii) participation in activities (iii) membership
4. Role assumption	Conformity to perceived role requirements of group II	Conformity to actual role requirements of group II
5. Social acceptance	Perceived acceptance by group II	Actual acceptance by group II
6. Group membership	Self-identification with group II	Identification of group II membership by (i) group I members (ii) group II members (iii) society at large
7. Convergence of norms	Perceived congruence between own and group II norms	Actual congruence between own and group II norms

## 2.3 Change in Group Membership: Ronald Taft

Ronald Taft (1957, 1961, 1962a, 1967, 1970), who studied immigrant integration in Australia, developed a general model of assimilation that explains the processes of changing one's group membership. The big difference between the above models and that of Taft is certainly the perspective. While the race relation cycles focus on group relations, Taft's social-psychological model focuses on the individual. It should be noted that Taft understands his model as not being limited to explaining immigrant integration but as a general model describing the process of changing one's group membership (Taft 1957, p. 141).

In his model (see Table 2.2), Taft (1957) places more emphasis on attitudes, norms, role attitudes, and role behaviors. The model consists of seven stages, but in contrast to the above models, it does not necessarily assume a linear relation between these stages. All the stages are differentiated according to internal and external aspects of changing the group membership. The internal part refers to aspects within the individuals, such as assumed knowledge or perceived acceptance by a certain group. This is mirrored by the external part, which conversely refers to aspects outside the individual, such as actual knowledge or actual acceptance by a certain group.

The first stage is referred to as cultural learning, describing the acquisition of the group's cultural knowledge a person wants to become a member of. This is easier the smaller the cultural distance between the two groups is. The internal dimension of the process refers to the person's assumed knowledge, the external dimension to her



or his actual knowledge. The internal part of the second stage refers to (favorable) attitudes toward the new group's members, norms, and one's membership in this group, while the external part refers to an active seeking of interactions with the new group's members, participation and membership in this group. Taft (1957, p. 146) asserts that "this reality testing period is a very delicate one; not only can a misunderstanding easily nip up the assimilation in the bud, but it is also at this stage that a lack of common norms (Stage 7) or mutual knowledge (Stage 1) lead readily to misunderstandings." Inclusion into the new group goes hand in hand with a withdrawal from one's original group, the third stage. Internally, this refers to (unfavorable) attitudes toward the original group's members, norms, and one's membership and externally, it describes a withdrawal from this group's activities. After the third stage, a person will attempt to behave in accordance with the new group's role expectations, which is differentiated into conformity to the perceived role requirements (the internal aspect) and conformity to the actual role requirements (the external aspect). This stage is followed by the new group's acceptance of the new member. Again we find a distinction between an external aspect (actual acceptance) and its internal counterpart (perceived acceptance). In the sixth stage, the person identifies with the new group, which is the internal component. Moreover, the person is perceived to belong to the new group by members of her or his former group, by members of her or his new group, and by the society at large, which makes for the external part of this stage. The seventh and last stage describes the (perceived and actual) convergences of the norms with those of the new group and its new member.

Contrary to the race relation cycles, Taft explicitly denotes factors that influence the progression of the assimilation process. On the side of the individual, these are personal characteristics such as intelligence, tolerance, adaptability, and the like. On the side of the receiving society, these are attitudes toward the inclusion of the immigrants, which can vary between "pressing, willing, indifferent, unwilling or blocking" (Taft 1957, p. 154). Taft (1963, p. 279), moreover, distinguishes between three different forms of assimilation: monistic, pluralistic, and interactionist. Monistic assimilation is akin to Park's understanding: it assumes that the individual who changes her or his group membership is completely absorbed in the new group, shedding all loyalties to values and norms of the former group. Pluralistic assimilation describes a situation in which two groups mutually accept and tolerate their differences. Interactionist assimilation refers to two groups becoming similar. This convergence is not achieved by the unilateral absorption of one group into the other, but by a mutual convergence of the two groups' behaviors and norms.

Taft's account of immigrant integration improves on the race relation cycles by delivering a detailed portrayal of the processes that are associated with changing one's group membership. The focus on individual immigrants' motivation, actions and their relation with their social environment has advanced the study of immigrant integration (Esser 1980, p. 56). However, Taft's model is rather unsystematic and does not allow inferring concrete hypotheses on the course of the integration process. It includes an array of processes that (can) take place when an individual changes his or her group membership, but it does not specify the conditions under which the processes take place or do not (Price 1969, p. 228). Moreover, although the stages in

the model are not assumed to be necessarily linear and sequential, little information is provided on the relations of the different stages; and while Taft (1963, p. 279) assumes the integration process can lead to different forms of assimilation, he does not specify the conditions leading to one or the other. But all of that is necessary if one is interested in an explanation of how integration comes about.

## 2.4 Absorption and Dispersion of Immigrants: Eisenstadt

Shmuel Eisenstadt, who investigated immigrant integration in newly founded Israel (1953, 1954a, b, 1956; Katz and Eisenstadt 1960), draws our attention to the influence immigration has on the receiving society. In Eisenstadt's model, immigrant integration results from an interplay of the immigrant's motives and skills and the receiving society's opportunities and restrictions for integration and, similar to Taft's account, complete assimilation is but one possible outcome.

Eisenstadt's model starts with the migration process itself, which he sees to be motivated by partial frustration with the life in the sending country (Eisenstadt 1953, p. 169). However, this dissatisfaction is limited to certain aspects of one's life in the country of origin. If the migration is motivated economically, for instance, this implies that the immigrant wants to change her or his economic situation. It does not imply, however, that the immigrant wants to change all other aspects of life. Consequently, the receiving country's attraction is limited to distinct societal aspects. And thus, the migrant's motivation to adapt is not universal as he or she remains attached to the country of origin and its culture in various ways (Eisenstadt 1954a, pp. 3–4).

Arriving in a new country entails strong behavioral uncertainty and social disorganization for the immigrants, which causes a process of “desocialization” (Eisenstadt 1954a, p. 6): values, norms, and (role-)expectations, to which the immigrant was accustomed, lose their validity. This is accompanied by a loss of status and opportunities for social participation. After the initial desocialization, a process of “resocialization” can take place, which is, according to Eisenstadt (1954a, p. 7), characterized largely by the institutionalization of new (role-)expectations and a gradual absorption of the receiving country's role- and value-system. This process includes the redefinition of old, established roles, the acquisition of new roles, and the transformation of the immigrants' basic identification into an identification with the new society and its shared values and goals (Eisenstadt 1953, p. 169). The outcome of this absorption process can be characterized by three indices: acculturation, personal adjustment, and dispersion (Eisenstadt 1953, p. 167; 1954a, p. 12 ff.). Acculturation refers to the acquisition of new skills, such as learning the new language, getting familiarized to new customs, norms, and (role-)expectations. Personal adjustment designates the immigrant's ability to handle frustration, insecurity, and disorganization in the receiving country. Dispersion, also referred to as institutional integration (Eisenstadt 1953, p. 167), refers to the immigrants' dissemination in the main institutional spheres, i.e. participation in familial, religious, economic and political domains of

Transnational Activities and Immigrant Integration in  
Germany

Concurrent or Competitive Processes?

Schunck, R.

2014, X, 301 p. 25 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-03927-5